A U M

As bow, grasping the hidden wisdom, the great weapon; laying on it the sharpened arrow, aspiration; drawing the bow by thought bent on that Being, know that the mark is that unfading Eternal. —MUNDAKA UPANISHAD.

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XX September, 1932 No. 11

SIGNS OF THE CYCLE

FEW indeed are those in any age who, while playing their own part in the great drama of existence, still preserve their integrity as a Spectator of the panorama. Involved and absorbed in the varying fortunes of the struggle for personal preferment, nearly all men lose consciousness of their Egoic identity, becoming for the time being merely the Actor in the scenes of their own creation, finally the mere Creature of the powers they have themselves invoked.

Yet, in very truth, each man has but to turn within himself to know that Self is neither perceiver, creator, nor creature, but all three at one and the same time—the three in One, and the One in three: the inherently changeless, the conditionally immortal, and the inherently changing. Neither past, nor present, nor future can ever be understood until Self is understood in all its phases and aspects from Unity to separateness, from Spirit to matter. So, everywhere and in all times, now as in all the past, the reincarnating Ego called man is at once the witness of and the sufferer by his disregard of the community of all Life, the inviolability of the Law of his own being. It is because these fundamental principles of the composite nature of every being are continually ignored or endeavored to be set aside by men, whatever their religion, or science, or philosophy, that we have life and death, good and evil, the image and the shadow of Self, continually before our consciousness as the eternal Reality.

In every time of stress and strain, whether for the individual or for the collectivity of Souls, each seeks immunity from the com-

mon lot. Hence power is sought that possessions may be gained; possessions are coveted so that the individual Soul may avoid its responsibility for the common weal, may avoid participation in the common woe. Hence the two mutually destructive ideas which at one and the same time inspire and betray mankind: the idea of freedom and the idea of irresponsibility.

It is through those few—the true Theosophists—who place responsibility at the root of all free-will, who accept it and so strive in the ever-becoming present to repair the mischiefs of the past for the sake of a better future for all—it is through these few that the Masters of Wisdom maintain from generation to generation their contact with our humanity and work on ceaselessly "for the redemption of every creature throughout the world."

The ignorant deal with each event that presents itself as if it were an isolated phenomenon, peculiar to themselves alone and either a punishment undeservedly inflicted or a merited reward. Their endeavor to avoid the one and to hold on to the other makes of their lives a frantic treadmill. When men are classified by the criterion of Soul-evolution and not by human measures of values, it is all too easy to see that the great majority of existing mankind belong to "those who received but a spark." This is their idea of Self, and hence their principle of conduct: "What do I want; what can I have; what will become of me?" Such men are to be encountered on every hand, in every walk of life—among the high even more frequently than among the lowly of this earth. They are as plentiful in proportion within the area of the Theosophical Movement as outside its sphere of influence. These are the spiritual *Sudras* and Pariahs of all lands.

They look naturally to and emulate the spiritual caste with which they are in contact—the *Vaishhyas,* those who have what they lack. This second class of men is called by translation the "merchant caste," but in truth it means the traders in all things for profit to themselves, traders in things spiritual and mental quite as much as in things physical and material. These traders are the natural rulers of mankind during *Kali Yuga,* the Dark Age in which all the race is now participant. They are at home in the pulpit of every church and temple of every religion; in the seats of the mighty in every government; in commerce and banking; in great industries; in schools and universities. They edit our newspapers and magazines; they write our books; they prescribe for all our ills. They are, in short, the most *promising* of all mankind. Yet these casuists to whom the ignorant and wretched turn for

succors and direction are themselves the very last to take their own medicine, the very last to be willing to be judged as they themselves sit in judgment, the very last to surrender the perquisites of government and trade places with those they govern. Sophisticated to the last degree, their sole Wisdom consists in this, that not one of them will trust the promises of any other. Thus to-day, as in the days of Rome, these soothsayers and augurs "greet each other with a smile" as they meet and pass on their way to and from their several "places of business." They have gained what they coveted, power, place, possessions, and irresponsibility: the universe is to them a Kingdom of rulers and ruled, where the governed exist for the sake of the Governors.

Until—until the catastrophe arrives for the nation, the race, the civilization, when all alike find themselves in the same boat, and that boat sucked into an incredible but actual maelstrom, threatening the common destruction of all. Such, by universal accord in the midst of all our discords, is the present state of the tide in the affairs of mankind, West and East.

Is there, then, no hope for ourselves and our civilization, or must we also witness and suffer our own helpless engulfment in the great sea of oblivion which has swallowed up so many former races and civilizations?

That depends: it depends not alone on the facts, appalling as these may be and to which all men testify. Nor does it depend on the meaning of the facts, for many thoughtful men, in the present as in the past, have diagnosed and proclaimed the inevitableness of our common destiny "unless something is done."

When one enquires what that something is which all alike declare must be done, the confusion of tongues exceeds the clamor of the distressed. One fact emerges: each voice with a cure-all insists that his is the only prescription, and derides all others; each, examined in turn, is easily seen to be but a new-old promise to those who have lost all confidence because of the bankruptcy of their own ideas and ideals. Even the dullest minds distrust the efficacy of creeds, platforms, formulas of any kind. Even the emptiest stomachs suspect the hand that feeds them. A world of doles is a doleful world even to its beneficiaries. The great blind, patient mass demands a change that shall produce a new order of ages. Everywhere it is evolution or revolution in the mental and moral atmosphere of mankind. What will come of it all?

It depends on the Theosophists, the true Theosophists, irrespective of degree, of rank, time, place, or circumstance. Every

humanitarian, regardless of human distinctions, definitions, or limitations, is such a Theosophist. Every man willing and *determined* to serve his fellows, to share their mistakes, their misfortunes, and their miseries, unconcerned as to whom, or where, or how his service may be rendered, reckless of what may befall himself, is such a Theosophist.

Look about you, you who are seeking to find the Way, and wherever your regard falls, there you will find the sheep and the wolves in sheep's clothing, and in the midst of the ravened and the ravening you will see a member of the Brotherhood, one of the sacred band of heroes, sharing his all of time, money, and work in the service of the living, the dying, and the dead. His neither the clamor nor the complaint, neither the despair nor the greed of the many. He is not seen by the naked who see only the garments that he takes from his own back to give them. He is not seen by the hungry whose eyes are on the bread he takes from his own mouth wherewith to feed them. He is not heard by the deaf to any interest but their own save as he speaks solace to them, bespeaks forgiveness for them. Neither the spoiler nor the spoiled have any interest in Brotherhood save as it is manifested to them, save as a cloak to hide their depredations. The true Theosophist knows all this, but goes quietly, serenely on with his self-chosen task, for the secret of Life is his; it suffices and sustains him through the gates of hell, through the gates of death.

What is that secret of secrets? "The whole secret of Life is in the unbroken series of its manifestations." The true Theosophist knows that death, disease, suffering and evil are nothing new in human life—that they have been with us for millions of years, singly and in the mass. What we are reaping is what we have sown; what we are sowing is what we shall reap. It is by men that human woes are generated. It is by Man they must be alleviated and finally cured. Every act of Brotherhood, every sharing of the misfortunes of others voluntarily undertaken is such alleviation. Every effort to enlighten another as to the true causes of human misery, every word spoken, every thought generated, every aspiration nourished, every hope rekindled is such curative prescription. Every effort made by each true Theosophist is no isolated fact, no personal act of merit in the great reservoir of Egoic consciousness. It is one of a series of countless similar influxes of the Divine life into the sphere of human consciousness. It is cumulative, energic, directive, irresistible, when its mass-momentum is achieved. Out of the blackness of *Kali Yuga* is born the Golden Age.

The present, so sinister in appearance, so portentous in prospect, is to the true Theosophist the very hour in which to sow far and wide, in act and word and thought, the good seed brought by H. P. B. For them it is the season of planting, not the time of dreadful harvest. H. P. B. brought us more than a teaching: she brought an inspiration that remains alive and increasing. Judge did more than set us an example; he kept unbroken the channel between the world of Masters and the world of men. Robert Crosbie was more than a faithful Student: in the unbroken series of the manifestations of the Theosophical Movement he became in all things like unto them, as they had before him become in all things like unto us.

The Divine seed is in every true Theosophist. It germinates in service; it grows in sharing the Karma of collective humanity; it flourishes in giving light and comfort to the toiling pilgrims; it ripens abundantly into the harvest which we know from afar as the Master of Wisdom—the Adept in true Brotherhood.

Whoever, and most of all in these troublous times, whoever preaches the gospel of good-will, teaches Theosophy. Whoever, and most of all in this dark hour of humanity, whoever teaches Theosophy, preaches the gospel of good-will. Let every man who calls himself Theosophist but ponder the world's need and his own duty, and there can be naught but Unity among us all—the Unity and Fraternity of study, work, and application in the assimilation and dissemination of the timeless ideas and ideals of the Wisdom-Religion.

The True Basis

On the day when Theosophy will have accomplished its most holy and most important mission—namely to unite firmly a body of men of all nations in brotherly love and bent on a pure altruistic work, not on a labor with selfish motives—on that day only will Theosophy become higher than any nominal brotherhood of man. This will be a wonder and a miracle truly, for the realization of which Humanity is vainly waiting for the last eighteen centuries, and which every association has hitherto failed to accomplish.—*H.P.B.*

ARE WE ESCAPISTS?

SO great has become the desire for individual freedom that the term "escapist philosophy" is used to describe the kamic and mental condition of many who would find freedom in isolation. A life of solitude on a desert island is desired by many, driven frantic by pressure of circumstances, and some even seek escape through suicide. If we lived but once on earth we might thus escape, otherwise the chains we break today may bind more tightly tomorrow. We are not educated by playing truant from school, and no one ever acquired a practical education on a desert island.

The desire for privacy is not unnatural but the yearning for liberty through isolation *is*. The student of occultism desires privacy for study and assimilation of experiences undergone, not at all for avoiding experiences. When we are willing to pass through all experiences we become self-taught; that is, taught by the Self of all creatures. *We pass through* experiences, learning as we pass and preparing for greater experiences, so that there is really no need of escape.

Nature's law provides contacts for the purpose of self-education in the science of liberty just as it supplies *contrasts* by which we learn. Natural impulse is followed by self-induced and self-devised efforts, while freedom is gained through contacts. Do we learn more Theosophy through studying the teachings or through association with our fellow-beings in the light of the teachings?

If we do not yet appreciate the value of contacts, perhaps we do not yet consider them as steps in our quest for freedom. "Rest is not quitting this busy career; rest is but fitting oneself to one's sphere." We encounter in our study many statements whose real value remains hidden until revealed by contacts we would avoid; irritations caused by neighbors, reverses of fortune, family troubles, lost hopes and disappointments bring to us facts that the books tell about but which we really recognize only "in the flesh."

The teachings give us pattern and inspiration for action; our actions and their reactions upon us through our fellow beings force our theories into practice. We may learn goodness by observing its effects in the actions of others. If we do not so learn, our actions upon others will in time bring reactions upon ourselves that will make the value of right action apparent. In attempting to act for and as the Self we may be shamed into right thought and action by those who practice what we only preach.

The Masters have had to go through worse circumstances than our present ones. Had They tried to escape They would not now be Masters. Their method of escape was: "The shortest way out is straight through." Some have accused the Masters of selfishness in avoiding personal contact with other men. We, ordinary human beings, must have contact with each other to learn what we are. When a king and a slave exchange glances, seeing only a slave and a king, neither one knows the other nor himself. The "relation" between the perceiver and the thing perceived is that of *identity*. Each man who looks at his neighbor may also be glimpsing God, if he but knew it.

We learn truth by overcoming error. "The truth is obscured by that which is not true, and therefore all creatures are led astray." If we still think of ourselves as personalities, we can hardly think of the Masters as other than personal beings; until we pass that point, we isolate ourselves from Them; not They from us.

The means of escape, then? As individual freedom is not true escape, the *Gita's* answer is:

"The man who is happy within himself, who is illuminated within, is a devotee, and partaking of the nature of the Supreme Spirit, he is merged in it. Such illuminated sages whose sins are exhausted, who are free from delusion, who have their senses and organs under control, *and devoted to the good of all creatures,* obtain assimilation with the Supreme Spirit. Assimilation with the Supreme Spirit *is on both sides of death* for those who are free from desire and anger, temperate, of thoughts restrained; and who are acquainted with the true Self."

We can by complying with all the conditions demonstrate to ourselves the fact of conscious immortality—the first condition being a willingness to consider it as a proposition. One of Mr. Judge's comments on Patanjali's yoga aphorisms applied here: "The qualities before spoken of, found in all objects and which had hitherto affected and delayed the soul, *have ceased to be mistaken by it for realities,* and the consequence is that the soul abides *in its own nature* unaffected by the great 'pairs of opposites'—pleasure and pain, good and evil, cold and heat, and so forth."

Escape from delusion we can and will. Escape from immortality is neither possible nor desirable. Through realization of immortality we escape from false and illusive mortal conditions and enter into the true freedom.

THEOSOPHY AND SCIENCE

An Inspection of Arms

> Behold! O Master, the mighty army of the sons of Pandu drawn up by thy pupil, the clever son of Drupada. In it are warriors with great bows, equal to Bhîma and Arjuna in battle . . . and all the sons of Draupadi, too, in their huge chariots. Be acquainted also with the names of those of our party who are the most distinguished. . . . They are all of them practiced in the use of arms, armed with divers weapons, and experienced in every mode of fight. This army of ours, commanded by Bhîshma, is not sufficient, while their forces, led by Bhîma, are sufficient. Let all the generals, according to their respective divisions, stand at their posts, and one and all resolve Bhîshma to support.—*Bhagavad-Ghîta, Chapter I.*

AT any given period, the life of a people is over-shadowed by some prevailing authority, religion, or philosophy; thinking is colored by it, and the respect of men centered upon it and upon its sponsors, who bask in the sunshine of popular reverence, finding the prevailing order good. But from time to time the divine discontent inherent in the race bursts its fetters and a new era is ushered in with more or less of turmoil. For a half-century we have been, and for a half-century more will be, in the midst of such a transition period.

Some centuries since, to utter doubts of the creeds, to cast disrespect upon the priest, was at the best to court classification as one weak of wit. Did not all men know that Holy Writ was the very criterion of truth? And how dare one dispute with the clergy, who could read and thus understood things hidden from the commonalty?

Now as ever before, men *will* have a creed, will have leaders esteemed more than common man by dint of greater education, deeper knowledge, or perchance greater pretense—in the mind of the crowd there is no dividing line. Now as ever, all hasten to travel comfortably together upon a beaten highroad; a road which was the Catholic Church some time since, and is now that strange hodge-podge of conflicting theories named "Science."

Unlike the old, the new state religion ministers to human desires in understood regions, dealing no longer in empty promises of the two kinds of hereafter. Hence, in a race whose song is "Material Good is the only God, and Science is His prophet," science has a

vastly firmer base, infinitely more potential power, than any of the Medieval hierarchies.

Theosophy had no quarrel with the teachings of Jehoshua "of Nazareth," for they are part and parcel with it. It had and has an unflinching battle to wage with the creeds and dogmas of whatsoever kind erected upon those pure and simple words, creeds quarried of ignorance and superstition and cemented with self-interest.

Theosophy has no quarrel with Science in its true sense; that is to say, with proven facts, nor even with theories when they be held or taught as merely such, however erroneous. It has, and has to wage war to the knife, with biased theories set forth as "facts;" with incompletely understood phenomena elaborated by the powers of imagination into "laws" and forced upon all and sundry. It has, in a word, no quarrel with *real* scientists, whose progenitors were the Crookes' and Curies. But it has a feud with the *teachings* of the "Sunday-supplement" scientist, of the pompous yearling graduate eager to claim for himself the name of "savant," and of the apostles of irresponsibility sometimes hight "biologist" or "endocrinologist;" he who, building upon partly understood facts and in serene ignorance of every other line of research than his own hobby, compounds acids to throw in the eyes of every man who dares look up from the slimy grovel of animal desires.

Unfortunately, the real scientist is not only submerged in the blatant notoriety-seeking of the fool in his assumed wisdom, but himself holds a legitimate position not lightly to be resigned. Gifted with intellect, of long and rigid training in his chosen line, and having spent the best years of his life in discovering what to him is truth new in the history of the Universe; often possessed of the best of motives, secure in the belief that true good for humanity lies along the road painfully hewn by himself; such is the scientist of the true *élite*. To such men the ultimate triumph of Theosophy would mean this: that during the laborious centuries of the rise of modern science, an obscure group of men beyond the Himalayas watched its struggles as a parent watches the feeble essays of a child; a group possessed not only of all the knowledge science has, or will obtain, but of powers now thought beyond the ken of mankind; powers so jealously guarded that not the greatest figure in all public life, past, present, or future, might be permitted to touch them save on one condition; that of resigning all pretense to present knowledge and of entering the portals of the Masters sworn, in life and for lives, to self-subjection under such disci-

pline as is unendurable even in idea to the men of the West. For Theosophy to triumph, for it to be recognized that the Guardians of the Wisdom now possess the ultimate criterions of all truth, means that men of science may no longer weave theories before the gaping multitudes; it means that the thrill of discovery must suffer paralysis, and that the investigator must sink to the rank of a builder of machines. It means that for "Science says" must be substituted "Theosophy teaches." Let us not disguise the seriousness of the issue; against this consummation scientific men, the best as well as the worst, will fight to the death.

When the swelling stream of fact, fed by their discoveries, shall begin to bear the race once more toward the ocean of Theosophy, but two alternatives will remain. The Scholar may, if his search has been honest and of good motives, literally follow the facts where they lead—and become a Theosophist. But "Narrow is the way, and few there be that find it." In all but a few, a very few cases, men brought to the issue, their motives laid bare, will choose belief rather than fact, theory rather than law, personal desire rather than truth. How often in the history of Theosophy have we seen human beings who once *knew,* "turn once more away from Truth's bright face!" Therefore let hopeful Theosophists look for little from men of science—save desperation when in its appointed course Theosophy rises from a slow fire burning underfoot, to the raging forest fire it was of yore, destroying without ruth the flimsy houses of mind, by loving and desirous fancy builded.

Already once more the self-sufficient ranks of the science of the day are awakening, stirring to a hidden menace as yet but dimly felt; nervous still from conflict with "Fundamentalism," whose unsuspected strength was placated by smooth and hurrying tongue, Science senses the unseen but crescendo power of a foe infinitely more dangerous. Science against Fundamentalism was a war of machine guns against pitchforks, of a battleship against a plesiosaurus. But the warriors of Theosophy, like some in the great conflict, cross the field empty-handed and take their weapons from the enemy. Not in the position of the theologians, armed with wooden guns and pious hope, are true Theosophists, however few in number as yet.

But efficient use of weapons requires skill; the more so when they are weapons of reason and fact; weapons to be employed in a manner strange to our hands and minds. For their use is to be for the enforcement, by facts, correlations, and instances drawn from all Nature, of the indwelling Law of Universal Brotherhood. Too

many of us, overborne by the vast pretense of science to cryptic knowledge, find not within themselves the courage and self-confidence to look in the cannon's mouth; to them as yet the infinite powers and infinite range of possibility of the human soul are not *real;* to them Theosophy is a *religion,* a *hope.* This attitude binds helpless so long as held; yet it is wretchedly unfounded. Theosophy is a statement of the fundamental laws of Nature; the mysteries of science are shallow when unearthed from their ponderous verbiage, and those minds—especially those which pretend to crushing discoveries—are no superhuman ones. The authority of the scientist more often arises from years of laborious specialization on the part of a mediocre mind, than from any vast intelligence or learning. The best of true scientists inveigh against the poverty of outlook, the lack of system, the self-advertisement, the duplication of effort, and the unfamiliarity with coordinate facts, of the average scientist. Such minds as this do not win decisions on ultimate philosophical issues—and: all their facts are ours and every scientist who publishes truths our unconscious ally. More than that, there are already a few wooden horses in the scientific Troy, and there will be more as the truly honest, earnest, and intelligent "come out from among them." The war will not be bloodless; we must prepare for stern events; for the cycle last century will come again, and some may learn in person the cost of Theosophy to the Messengers. Perchance no full decision may issue; but neither will the battle be lost—if those who hold the Wisdom in trust be true and be brave; the cycle is here.

"Therefore fight, O Bharata!"

From the Tao Teh King

The one who knows does not speak; the one who speaks does not know. The wise man shuts his mouth and closes his gates. He softens sharpness, unravels his tangles, dims his brilliancy, and reckons himself with the mysterious.

He is inaccessible to favor or hate; he cannot be reached by profit or injury; he cannot be honored or humiliated. Thereby he is honored by all.

WHO ARE THEOSOPHISTS?

ALTHOUGH there are many people in the world today whose Karma in their present incarnation has not brought them into conscious contact with Theosophy, the number of those who have had the priceless opportunity offered to them to benefit by the mission which H. P. B. came into our midst to fulfil is very great. That Mission was and is to make once more available for all a knowledge of those great fundamental and eternal Truths upon the recognition of which depends the destiny of mankind for ages to come. It is with those who have this opportunity that rests the responsibility not only of availing themselves of it for their own benefit, but above all of carrying on, in unbroken continuity and along the lines laid down, the mission of H. P. B., making it *their* mission to the best of their ability and power.

How many of all those who have consciously contacted the Theosophical Movement of our day in any true sense benefited by the opportunity had, let alone felt the responsibility that inevitably goes with it? Countless people in every country, it is true, have heard about Theosophy; a great many there are who call themselves Theosophists; but how many know what Theosophy really is; how many of all those who call themselves Theosophists, are Theosophists in a true sense?

As a matter of fact the great body of "Theosophists" in the world at large presents three aspects, or classes. First in number are those who still see in Theosophy a belief, a theory, a speculation—something to be accepted or rejected. They listen to what other people have to say about Theosophy, instead of finding out for themselves what *Theosophy* has to say. They approve or disapprove, they like or dislike what they hear, according to whether or not it agrees with their own prejudices and preconceptions. They are not seeking for Truth, but for a confirmation of their beliefs. They are best characterized perhaps by the term "would-be Theosophists," since they would be Theosophists *if*—well, if Theosophy perchance were more in accord with what *they* think, or if it did not deny altogether the existence of a personal god, or again, if instead of stressing so much the importance of ethics, Theosophy had more "practical" rules to offer for "self-development," and so on and so on.

Then there are those who have come to realize that Theosophy is more than a mere belief, more than just something to be accepted or rejected; who have recognized the inherent reasonable-

ness of its teachings, who see in them a system of knowledge of overwhelming magnitude, but who, nevertheless, convinced of its truth and value, set out courageously to make it their own by diligent study of the books, through a sincere and steady intellectual effort. To them Theosophy is a knowledge to be gained, and as learners of that knowledge they call themselves Theosophists.

The third class is constituted of those for whom Theosophy is not only more than a belief, however sublime, but also more than a mere body of knowledge, however vast—those for whom Theosophy is *a mode of living*. Hence they set out to make Theosophy a living power in their lives, to provide in themselves a channel through which that power may flow—unobstructed by false ideas and selfish ambitions—not *their* power, but the power of Truth itself; not for *their* benefit, but as a beneficent stream for all they come in contact with. Whether or not they call themselves Theosophists, they *are* Theosophists—not because they have accepted Theosophy, not on account of their knowledge of Theosophy, but because they are "engaged in the true service of Humanity—" which always was and always will be the first and foremost object of the Theosophical Movement.

Let us ask ourselves to which of the three classes we think to belong. Are we sure, perhaps, that we have long ago overcome all our beliefs, all our prejudices and false ideas, that we have completely eradicated the deep-rooted tendency to look at Theosophy from our own preconceived notions, instead of examining *ourselves* in the light of Theosophy? Do we perchance consider ourselves beyond that stage where Theosophy is pursued as a mere intellectual study, fancying that we have safely crossed the wide gulf that separates the eye-doctrine from the Doctrine of the Heart, and have earned the right to proclaim ourselves true Theosophists?

If we do, let us beware, lest we fail to recognize that those distinctions seen amongst Theosophists at large, are but the faithful reflections of the self-same distinctions co-existing within ourselves; lest we fail to realize that "would-be Theosophist," "so-called-Theosophist" and "true Theosophist" are not separate, but only different aspects of one and the same thing—human nature, and therefore of our nature. Which of the three shall finally rule supreme, in ourselves as well as in the world at large, depends not upon how good a Theosophist anyone is trying to make of himself or thinks himself to be, but upon the extent to which each one forgets himself in making Theosophy available for all others who might become Theosophists, if they were given the opportunity.

SCIENCE AND THE SECRET DOCTRINE

XXXV *(In Three Parts)*

I

THE wave of popular interest so evident a few years ago regarding the evolution of man has largely subsided—probably because people have had reason lately to substitute for wonder as to whence we came in the distant past, concern for whither we are going in the immediate future. Nevertheless an astonishing accumulation of the most significant facts has collected during the past year or two.

These facts show scientific evolutionism standing unsteadily at the confluence of two dark streams of mystery such as never entered Darwin's wildest dreams. Stream first bears on its bosom a welter of conflicting fact and opinion regarding the causes and *rationale* of evolution from the biologic standpoint. Stream second is littered with tangled and conflicting inter-special relationships as between animal and man, man and man.

For the time being let us confine ourselves to the former, which might be called the subjective or inner phase of the puzzle, as against the external, zoological, and paleontological, which may be reserved for another consideration on its own account.

So conflicting, in fact, has the evidence become as to have definitely produced the birth of evolutionary sectarianism.[1] Professors Julian Huxley and Henry Fairfield Osborn are leaders of the "Modernist" sect, which holds that "natural selection" is largely mythical and that Darwinism is a partial and primitive form of belief. Others, such as Prof. Edward B. Poulton, of Oxford, are "pure unreconstructed Darwinists." Immediately significant in this relationship is the opinion of Dr. R. E. Snodgrass, of the U. S. Bureau of Entomology, who points out that the *real* "missing link" has been overlooked.[2]

The gap between man and his putative ape-like ancestor, he says, is insignificant as compared with the gap between winged creatures and those without wings. So striking and so evident is this fact, we would add, that its neglect could only have come about through an almost hypnotic engrossment in other directions. For, obviously, "natural selection" can only develop an organ which is of some use to begin with. And with equal obviousness a rudimentary

---

[1] *Literary Digest*, October 24, 1931.
[2] *The Week's Science*, November 24, 1930.

wing is a handicap and not help. Even if developed out of some other type of limb, it must pass through a stage where it has lost its use as a limb and not become useful as a wing. The progressive degeneration of a wing, and its development into a limb, would be easy to understand and in line with many things which have happened in the evolutionary field; but that would make all animal life—including man—the descendant of some winged form! And this is outside of the wildest dreams of evolution—whose theories all run the other way!

Thus year by year "natural selection" falls into the discard, driving evolutionists into deeper and deeper research, into semi-mysticism, regarding the real causes, unknown, but of necessity recognized as *internal.*

Drs. Chappell and Pike, of Columbia University,[3] point out the previous confusion between causal and limiting factors. "Natural selection," they state, "not being a force, cannot deliver energy to organisms. It merely limits that delivery, and is thus not causally related to evolution, which it cannot promote any more than it can organize matter." The old question of variation, they say, remains unanswered now as in Darwin's time. If evolution is a characteristic of life, they hold, offspring will arise which are different from, and more complex than, the parents.

> It is . . . a mere device of rhetoric to credit "Natural Selection" with the power of *originating* species. "Natural Selection" is no Entity; but a convenient phrase for describing the mode in which the survival of the fit and the elimination of the unfit among organisms is brought about in the struggle for existence . . . But Natural Selection, in the writer's humble opinion, "Selection, *as a Power,*" is in reality a pure myth; especially when resorted to as an explanation of the origin of species. It is merely a representative term expressive of the manner in which "useful variations" are stereotyped when produced . . . The real question at issue is: what CAUSE — combined with other secondary causes — produces the "variations" in the organisms themselves. (*Secret Doctrine,* 1888, II, 648).

Dr. Adolph Schultz, of Johns Hopkins, considers that the basis of evolution is just this fact—that no two organisms are absolutely alike.[4] This inherent tendency to differentiate was shown experimentally by the study of some hundreds of monkeys, of the same species, and having exactly the same environment in every respect

---

[3]*Science,* October 24, 1930.

[4]*Science,* October 16, 1931.

for generations. Of these specimens, collected around one camp in Nicaragua, no two were alike. Deep indeed, and fundamental withal, are the causes of this eternal differentiation. Said a Master in 1882:

> . . . Look around you and see the myriad manifestations of life, so infinitely multiform; of life, of motion, of change. What caused these? From what inexhaustible source came they, by what agency? Out of the invisible and subjective they have entered our little area of the visible and objective. Children of Akasa, concrete evolutions from the ether, it was force which brought them into perceptibility and Force will in time remove them from sight of man. Why should this plant in your garden to the right, have been produced with such a shape and that other one to the left with one totally dissimilar? Are these not the results of varying actions of Force—unlike correlations? Given a perfect monotony of activities throughout the world, and we would have a complete identity of forms, colours, shapes and properties throughout all the kingdoms of nature. It is the *motion* with its resulting conflict, neutralization, equilibration, correlation, to which is due the infinite variety which prevails.

And this *motion* is the very essence of Life itself; the shadow of eternal unchanging *absolute unconditioned* motion of Mulaprakriti which neither hastens nor slackens from dawn to dark of Manvantara, from dusk to morn of Pralaya.

Among the more newly recognized mysteries of evolution is the fact that certain changes take place, evidently according to some law, but without relation to external environment and without ostensible object. Sir Arthur Keith, for instance, called attention to a strange anomaly. The size of the human face and jaw is being reduced among Europeans, as has long been recognized.[5] This has been officially ascribed to the use of softer foods. *But the same thing is happening to African bushmen devoid of any civilized influence.* Sir Arthur says "some mysterious law" is doing this—and lets it go at that; very wisely, considering the profundity of the causation to be deduced only from Theosophic philosophy!

For in fact it is evidently due to vast quasi-*cosmic* changes. The European belongs to the Fifth Root Race, well beyond the central, or most material point, of the cyclic arc of evolution for the local manvantara. As stated by Madame Blavatsky, the tendency henceforth is toward a finer, a more delicate physical type as man grows out of the bonds of matter during future millions of years. This

[5] *The Week's Science*, May 26, 1930.

type will tend toward the ideal forms developed in long past manvantaras at their culmination. But also the Fifth Race is overlapped by the Fourth, and even by portions of the Third, both of which reached their apices in periods so many millions of years ago as to be beyond the credulity of material science. And such overlapping races tend to take on the type of the new, to develop with it. The cause of this is obviously metaphysical; and correlated with a fact to which W. Q. Judge called attention: that the sun carries its planets on a great sweep through the universe, of such nature that the identical spot is never traversed twice. Far-reaching changes, said he, are due to the resulting alterations of cosmic influence. It is not such as Dr. Millikan, the famous discoverer of the "Cosmic Ray," who will dispute the possibility!

The mysteries involved in these changes become more complex from the physical point of view the more they are studied. It is possible, says Dr. Osborn, to distinguish between organs which are static and those which are dynamic.[6] It actually happens that one portion of an organ may be in rapid evolution while a contiguous part is standing absolutely still. Certainly this is a nut for the materialist school of evolution to crack! Current genetics holds that mutations are brought about by changes in the genes—the supposed physical carriers of heredity. On the contrary, says Dr. Osborn, the bio-mechanical principles of change are directly contrary to this assumption. While the modes of transmutation of form are clear (?), the internal causes of the bio-mechanical transmutations of the germ-plasm are more mysterious and incomprehensible than in the days of Darwin! In primarily mechanical adaptations, sudden germinal mutation is not only improbable but without the least empirical foundation.[7] This, says Dr. Osborn, brings paleontology—the objective side of evolutionary study by which the picture of what has actually physically and externally happened is eternally concreted in the stones themselves—into direct conflict with current theories as to *how* it happened.

Professor Maurice Caullery, speaking at the 11th Congress of Zoology in September 1930, went into these difficulties in some detail.[8] It was necessary, said he, to examine the situation presented by "these great problems which change from time to time but are never completely solved." The beliefs of a generation ago are very different from those of today, and we have gained caution in these matters. August Weissman, with his doctrines of 1885, inaugu-

[6]*Science*, May 22, 1931. [7]Do. May 15, 1931. [8]Do. Sept. 11, 1931.

rated a change which ended in tearing down the idea of the inheritance of acquired characters. (Theosophists will find H.P.B.'s comments on Weissman's "almost true" theory in the *Secret Doctrine,* Vol. I, p. 223). Prof. Caullery, like Dr. Osborn, did not believe that mutations and genetical laws are enough to account for evolution as we see it exhibited in paleontology. The mutations so far produced by experimentation are detrimental rather than beneficial, and would tend to be eliminated by selection. He doubted whether mutations were really capable of giving rise to distinct species. It is now well established that adaptation is not a universal characteristic of organisms. Are the genetic theories merely valid for certain periods only, during which groups become diversified? Or, do evolutional transformations depend on *some other causes which still elude us?* (Italics ours).

This (Theosophically) satisfactory state having been arrived at by Prof. Caullery, let us return to Dr. Osborn, who by now has something more definite to offer.[9] It has required, he says, 62 years of evolutionary observation to demonstrate that organic, like inorganic, nature, does nothing by accident or chance, but only by means of universally prevailing laws which reveal themselves only over long periods of time. We are compelled to return to the creational concept of evolution, divesting the word of "its old theological and philosophical implications." (As to the former, well and good; as to the latter, we would like to see him accomplish the feat!). His definition of the new concept is six-pointed—appropriately so, thus being symbolic of biological form minus spirit. It is:

1. Uniformitarian rather than cataclysmic.
2. Centrifugal rather than centripetal.
3. Creational rather than variational.
4. Reactional rather than entelechistic.
5. Anti-energistic rather than synenergistic.
6. Anticipatory rather than empirical.

Unfortunately many of these expressions are more remarkable for terminology than for clearness. But two at least of them appear to be rankly contradictory.

If evolution is reactional, rather than entelechistic, that is, responsive to external pressure rather than developed by inner intelligence, how comes it he flatly remarks that many organs evolve in the geneplasm before there is actual need for them rather than afterwards? He enlarges somewhat on this last thesis, which, he

[9]Do. Dec. 4, 1931.

says, is contrary to Lamarck and Herbert Spencer, who thought that mind was built up through experience. On the contrary, says Dr. Osborn, a much larger intelligence exists among primitive people than they have need for; mathematical intelligence being found among Eskimos who had no need for counting even on their fingers. If Dr. Osborn were to turn to Theosophical ethnology for an answer to this, he would find a new "slant" on the presence of latent inherited intelligence in a degenerated race.

But let us leave these learned, hard-working, and now somewhat humbled gentlemen with their puzzles while we turn to a wisdom which, though as yet fathomless to most, is bare of confusions and contradictions:

> These purely *secondary* causes of differentiation, grouped under the head of sexual selection, natural selection, climate, isolation, etc., etc., mislead the Western Evolutionist and offer no real explanation whatever of the "whence" of the "ancestral types" which served as the *starting point* for physical development. The truth is that the differentiating "causes" known to modern science only come into operation after the *physicalization of the primeval animal root-types out of the astral.* Darwinism only meets Evolution at its midway point —that is to say when astral evolution has given place to the play of the ordinary physical forces with which our present senses acquaint us. But even here the Darwinian Theory, even the "expansions" recently attempted, is inadequate to meet the facts of the case. The underlying physiological variation in species—one to which all other laws are subordinate and secondary—is a sub-conscious intelligence pervading matter, ultimately traceable to a REFLECTION of the Divine and Dhyan-Chohanic wisdom . . . Hartmann . . . regards evolution as intelligently guided by the UNCONSCIOUS (the Cosmic *Logos* of Occultism). But the latter acts only mediately through FOHAT, or Dhyan-Chohanic energy, and not quite in the direct manner which the great pessimist describes. (*S.D.* II, 648-9).

> All these difficulties would vanish as the shadows of night disappear before the light of the rising Sun, if the following esoteric axioms were admitted: (*a*) the enormous antiquity (and the existence) of our planetary chain; (*b*) the actuality of the Seven Rounds; (*c*) the separation of human races (outside the purely anthropological division) into Seven distinct Root-Races, of which our present European Humanity is the *fifth;* (*d*) the antiquity of Man in this (*Fourth*) Round; and finally (*e*) that as these Races evolve from

> ethereality to materiality, and from the latter back again into relative physical tenuity of texture, so every living (so-called) *organic* species of animals with vegetation included changes with every new Root-Race. (Do. II, 697).

Revolutionary as such doctrines yet seem to our puzzled scientists, they will have to come to them; and the day may lie within the present physical cycle of many readers.

THE KEYS OF EVOLUTION

From the very beginning of Æons—in time and space in our Round and Globe—the Mysteries of Nature (at any rate those which it is lawful for our races to know) were recorded by the pupils of those same now invisible "heavenly men," in geometrical figures and symbols. The keys thereto passed from one generation of "wise men" to the other. Some of the symbols, thus passed from the east to the west, were brought therefrom by Pythagoras, who was not the inventor of his famous "Triangle." The latter figure, along with the plane cube and circle, are more eloquent and scientific descriptions of the order of the evolution of the Universe, spiritual and psychic, as well as physical, than volumes of descriptive Cosmogonies and revealed *"Geneses."* The *ten points* inscribed within that "Pythagorean *triangle*" are worth all the theogonies and angelologies ever emanated from the theological brain. For he who interprets them—on their very face, and in the order given—will find in these seventeen points (the seven Mathematical Points hidden) the uninterrupted series of the genealogies from the first *Heavenly* to *terrestrial* man. And, as they give the order of Beings, so they reveal the order in which were evolved the Kosmos, our earth, and the primordial elements by which the latter was generated. Begotten in the invisible *Depths,* and in the womb of the same "Mother" as its fellow-globes—he who will master the mysteries of our Earth, will have mastered those of all others.—*S.D. I,* pp. 612-13.

BREAKING THROUGH

THOSE Theosophists who first approach the Fane over the road of Love spontaneous and unconditioned are indeed "scarce one in ten thousand." It may be said in general that to them certain characters among Humanity are at once a puzzle, an envy, an inspiration. Such characters, we mean, as Father Damien, the friend of the lepers; Father Joseph, newly dead, his co-worker and disciple; Eugene Debs, the Socialist martyr, and many another of that involuntary enigmatic brotherhood.

Their color of soul is Love; ungrudging, unasking, all-compassionate love for humanity, without even desire of recognition. This love is the common denominator of an order of men possessing naught else in common; neither religion, nor temperament, nor training; they seem as by some favoritism of Karma to have had from birth a spiritual strength and sustenance in the exercise of compassion for which many a Theosophist would give his right hand; on the devotional side, though materialists, fanatic Christians, or what-not, they have attained what to the Theosophist seems a step on the Path far ahead of his present hopes.

For what one of us, however determinedly he now essays the Path, ever approached it as did Buddha—moved inwardly from the first by a giant pity for Man such as bade him dare the strongholds of the Gods in behalf of their support and plaything? No; we came, most of us, to the Portal under the scourge of some personal anguish which had burned our notions out of us, and in frantic search of a lotion for the raw integument of the Soul. Or it was the intellectual symmetry and satisfaction of cold abstract Justice that drew us insidiously to the point where we could not turn back. Or it was a clear vision of a path of duty which *had* to be trodden, not because there was in it any savor or satisfaction, but because of plangent intimation from within that we never hereafter could receive aught but damnable discomfort at our own hands did we hang back. The love of the Sandal-tree that perfumes the slaying axe; the Christ saying, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do!": a holy, deathless, incorruptible Love for all Mankind, dispensing from our inner Spiritual Heart a balm to the personal self, puissant beyond anything the world could inflict—all this, only a *beau idéal* the while we doggedly, unfeelingly trod the mill of uninspiring duty. Nature's Heart we served and guarded with unflagging fealty, but *within* That our

seat was not; our footsteps wearily marked the outer snows, and no sacrifice seemed to bring us nearer.

What said a Teacher?

"What hell do you think you are in? The corresponding heaven is very near!"

The worst of evils is but the shadow of some great good. Do we not know by observation—alas, have not many of us more intimate experience?—that who wrongs another, infallibly, if unrepentant, learns to hate that other? Well, then, know that the converse is true. Ungrudging service to Man inexorably at long last brings us to the inner realm of *love* for Man. We grow to love that which we serve.

The commonest of self-deceits is labor for self, thinking it labor for humanity. In any case, the stretch of the cold corridors measures naught but past accumulations of indifference, of neglected duties, of incipient compassions unflowered, noble impulses stillborn. To girdle the globe needs but to place one foot before the other, *ceasing not;* thus, the summit of the ridge is unrecognized obtained; the infinities of beauty beyond, near strike blind the eyes habituated to harshness.

The vision does not at first endure; for a moment, for hours, perhaps for days, one knows beyond all tale or picture the meaning of Nirvana. For him no longer are friends or foes; he swims in an ocean of Life; Life in forms sweet, calling forth reverence and gratitude; Life unfortunate, imprisoned in sin and hate, the more to be loved and aided.

The vision passes; and it may even prelude a sojourn in hell—especially if the nature of a man be leaky with passion, so that "the spiritual transforms itself into the psychic, and dire results ensue." But it cannot fade wholly nor can its memory die. The road to recapture is known now; things cannot again be within the man as they have been.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS' FORUM

HOW *can one reform his mode of life if he is constantly attracting old, bad affinities?*

When we, as divine beings, undertook the task of raising up the whole of matter to a higher degree of consciousness, we undertook also the responsibilities and dangers inherent in such a duty. In order to do it we had to take on bodies of flesh and blood —matter. Most of us became so engrossed in these vehicles that we forgot the indwelling divinity; we began to regard ourselves as creatures instead of creators. Our original purpose of incarnation was obscured and we started to exploit for our selfish gratification the kingdoms of nature we had come to raise up. This began the long chain of affinities which we as Theosophists are attempting to adjust in our lives. The best proof that we can triumph is our present knowledge of who and what we really are and that it was ourselves who created the affinities. We made the bad associations; it is in our power to replace them with good ones. It may be staggering at first when we realize that after all "it is our own fault," but this knowledge should give us strength to go at our task of eradicating bad tendencies with redoubled vigor. Such action is only the preparation for our original duty for the performance of which we started this cycle of incarnation: to raise up the whole of matter.

If Theosophists do not believe in capital punishment, would they let a murderer go free?

(*a*) Is there not a great latitude between "going free" and being murdered, be it in the electric chair or by the noose? Has capital punishment made crime less, or has it taught the hanged or electrocuted wrongdoer anything? A criminal is a sick man and should be treated as such. All murderers are not criminals. A man having a fever from a bad cold and one lying at the point of death from yellow fever are not given the same treatment. Putting the murderer in the electric chair, or in solitary confinement, will not teach him that his act was wrong. His mind and feelings should be taught in addition to keeping his body occupied and busy. He should learn about life—what life is, what *he* is, and his fellowmen. Then he may be able to see, and no man on earth will need to teach him, for he will teach himself. It is a very difficult task, one that needs a great deal of thought and effort and patience! It is so much "easier" to execute him and get rid of him, but that is the greatest injustice done to a fellow human being, because capital

punishment is only deliberate, coldblooded and premeditated murder. Murder is murder whether within or without the law.

(*b*) If we mean by "free" the right to live, the answer is yes; the murderer should be allowed to live. How else is he to see justice working in the universe. The after-death state is not a state of learning but an effect state. In the eyes of a Theosophist, a murderer is the same as a sick man and should be treated accordingly. Of course, anyone who is a menace to society—whether a small-pox patient or a murderer—should not be allowed to freely mingle with others, but all criminals should be treated with a consideration for their condition. What ails them is that they have lost all feeling of Brotherhood. Christianity, with its personal god idea, its ideas of revenge and hatred, is responsible for the production of such human beings in our civilization. All criminals should be confined and even more carefully looked after than any physically sick person, and gradually brought to the point where they can be taught the fundamentals of Theosophy, which may bring back their lost sense of responsibility and their realization of brotherhood.

What happens to criminals after death if they are executed?

(*a*) Executed criminals can do much more harm than embodied ones, for they continue to live until the end of what their normal life would have been, with the same tendencies and thoughts, but without a physical vehicle. This means that they work through weak-willed people *in* bodies and influence them much more strongly than they could if they were alive. Hence, one strong objection against capital punishment by Theosophists.

(*b*) They continue to live out their life span on the astral plane, minus the physical body. They are not really dead, as Mr. Judge says, and "are ever rehearsing in *Kama-Loka* their crime, their trial, their execution and their revenge." This desire for the gratification of unsated passions and the hunger for vengeance leads the unfortunate shell to seek contact with sensitives and mediums for the purpose of influencing them to carry out the evil desires which he cannot fulfill, lacking as he does, the physical instrument.

Are indignation, resentment and hatred never justifiable? Against the murderer of a good and innocent man, for instance?

(*a*) Indignation and resentment are but degrees of hatred and hatred never is justifiable. We all know only all too well what hatred is; it is our fear and hatred that cloud our true understanding and prevent us from seeing straight and clearly. Should we not rather feel pity and compassion for the murderer? It is he who is the greatest sufferer, as he will have to put forth great

efforts to repair the wrong done. The murdered man, especially if he is "good and innocent" loses only his physical body, but cannot be harmed otherwise. Why are we horrified at a murder? May it not be that through bitter experience we have learned our lesson? Not to feel indignation or resentment against a thing does not mean to sanction it or approve of it; we must ever fight that which is wrong, but shall never win the fight by indignation, resentment or hatred. Hatred in whatever degree only increases the hatred that already exists. Let us transform the destructive force of hatred into the creative force of Love or Compassion. Real Love is not goody-goody, weak and colorless, but energetic, strong and radiant, and is the True Warrior in us.

(*b*) Never. The man who commits a crime, no matter how evil, is in reality an embodiment of Spirit, which, as Krishna says, "neither killeth nor is it killed." We may judge the act but not the person. Buddha said, "Hatred ceases by love; this is an old rule." If this rule were applied universally—if everyone were to regard the criminal with compassion and understanding—think of the effect it would have on him. In all likelihood he would be so surprised that he would change his way of life completely.

Is the "lower nature" always "bad"?

(*a*) Is the ocean bad? Is the sun bad? Yet many drown in the sea and lose their lives through a sunstroke! Nothing is either good or bad in itself, it is *we* who make it so through our use or mis-use of it. Without the "lower nature" Man would have no instrument here to work with and through. We must learn to know our lower nature and control it, using it when, how, and where it is necessary. It is like possessing a team of very fiery, spirited and unruly horses; we can sit down on the job, refuse to drive the horses, let them go wherever they wish, and first thing you know, horses, carriage and we, are at the bottom of a precipice, a total wreck; or, we can hold the reins firmly and pit our strength and will against the horses, making them go where we wish them to go in order to perform our work. The lower nature is neither good, nor bad, for that matter; the use we make of it is "good" or "bad." Good or bad for what? For the Real Man, who through the lower nature is enabled to carry on his work and learn his lesson, or is hindered therein.

(*b*) Our lower nature is not something pocketed off and identified with a label, not some definite part of the mind or the emotions. That old pocketing propensity belongs to the generation of John Stuart Mills and the crowd of nineteenth century determinists

which followed him. But the ancient and eastern outlook, as was also Spinoza's, had the capacity to look at things relatively. Yet the capacity to see things from many angles, when not tending to scepticism, is far more profound than any deterministic philosophy. Spinoza makes his distinction of lower and higher by the terms passive and active. The same emotions and mind may be looked at in two ways. In one we are drawn to feeling and thought from the outside; in the other we act from within, by force of will, completely our own masters. In Theosophy we would say that our lower nature consists roughly of body and desires. These are our *passive* instruments, and in so much as we are controlled through them, they may be considered our lower nature. But once controlled by the perfected human will, they become instruments of all that is good. So, let us call "lower" the passive nature and "higher" the actively god-like. Now what is bad is "bad for." What is bad for the active nature furthers the passive. But what we must do is to find what we ought to further. To most people it will obviously be the active, the higher, and progressive nature. Anything which retards man in his evolution to a greater self-realization is bad, because it is "bad for" that realization. Most certainly our passive inclinations are always "bad for," because they are the very opposite, the drag of our progress.

KARMA AND "FATE"

Question: Is not fate closely connected with Karma?

Answer: It depends on how you look at it; that is, if you put your finger in the fire, the "fate" is to have a burn. The time to have decided the fate was before you put your finger in the fire. The only "fate" is that which comes from our own decisions.—*R.C.*

STUDIES IN KARMA

IX

"Friendships"

MAN has never been without a friend, but has a line of elder brothers who continually watch over the progress of the less progressed, preserve the knowledge gained through æons of trial and experience, and continually seek for opportunities of drawing the developing intelligence of the race on this or other globes to consider the great truths concerning the destiny of the soul. These elder brothers also keep the knowledge they have gained of the laws of nature in all departments, and are ready when cyclic law permits to use it for the benefit of mankind. They have always existed as a body, all knowing each other, no matter in what part of the world they may be, and all working for the race in many different ways.

In ages past perhaps we knew those who long since have passed up to greater heights. The very moment in the long series of incarnations we come near to where they are pursuing their pilgrimage, they at once extend assistance, whether that be on the material or moral planes. And it makes no difference whether one or the other is aware of who is assisting or who is being assisted. Inflexible law guides the current and brings about the result. Thus the members of the whole human family reciprocally act on one another, forced into it by a law which is as kind as it is great, which turns the contempt we bore in the past into present honor and opportunity to help our fellows.

Inasmuch as we learn almost solely from each other—as we are all here for each other—the question of the effect of affinities upon our acts and thoughts is enormous and wide. It anon saves us, and anon damns. For we may meet in our lives a person who has a remarkable effect for good or ill, because of the affinities engendered in past lives. And Theosophy also teaches that those who are like unto each other and love each other will be reincarnated together whenever the conditions permit.

Recognition depends on the inner sight and not on outward appearance. Part of the power of Karma is in the "mysterious power of meditation," which exhibits itself according to the particular corporeal body one has assumed. In reassuming a body, the "mysterious power" spoken of reaches out to numberless affinities engendered in other lives, and takes hold of all that come in its reach.

Other beings once known to the man arrive into incarnation at the same time, and bring into action affinities, attractions, and powers that can only act through them and him. Their influence cannot be calculated. It may be good or bad, and, just as he is swayed by them or as his sway the other being, so will work out the Karma of each.

The same law that throws us into life to suffer or enjoy, as may be deserved, decrees that the friends and the relatives who are like unto each other must incarnate together, until by reason of differentiation of character they cannot under any law of attraction remain in company. Not unless and until they become different do they separate from each other. And who would wish to be eternally tied to the side of uncongenial relatives or acquaintances merely because there was an accident of birth!

These effects, divergencies and swaying, are well known to occultists. This law is both an angel of mercy and a messenger of justice, for, while we have just stated its operation as among the risks, it is also a means whereby nature saves man often from damnation. Suppose in some life long-past I had a dear friend, or wife, or relative, with whom my intimacy was interior and deep. Death separates us, and in subsequent lives he devotes himself to truth, to wisdom, to the highest in him, while I go on careless of all but pleasure in the present. After many lives we meet again as either friends or acquaintances. At once the old intimacy asserts itself, and my former friend—although maybe neither of us knows it—has a strange power to touch my inward life, and wakes me up to search for truth and my own soul. It is the unexpended affinity, and by its aid nature works my salvation. Our real life is not in words of love or hate or coldness but in the fiery depths of the heart.—*Excerpted from W. Q. J.*

DEATH AND IMMORTALITY

THOSE beings whom history and tradition place as teachers of mankind showed by their lives and precepts that they *knew* something about Death. Among all those recognized as superior if not great souls there is no record of one fearing Death; on the contrary, they looked upon it as an old friend. One is almost forced to the conclusion that death to them occupied the same relative status as an exit for an actor. On the stage acting his part, he knows definitely that he existed in quite other circumstances before he took his cue and entered the play. When his duty is finished he steps out of one scene into another. Why should he be concerned?

Let us imagine for the moment that we *are* immortal, conscious Perceivers; that we enter into instruments, bodies, of various kinds in various conditions; that we use these instruments to experience states of life for which they are suited; that when the experience is completed we discard them as organized forms, retaining, however, the knowledge necessary to reconstruct them when necessity arises. Suppose further, that like the actor we *knew* we were only the temporary occupants of whatever house of life we were using. Would we not look upon Life and Death from an entirely different basis? What else except this knowledge would lead a Buddha to forego the rights and pleasures of a wealthy kingdom to become a simple teacher of mankind? What else would lead that being we call Jesus to patiently thread his way through a difficult and humble life in a conquered race and emerge as a figure to whom divine attributes are granted?

What has enabled priestcraft so easily to engrain in us the belief that at best we are but poor miserable creatures, irresponsible, and dependent on the favor of our creator not alone for circumstances here, but also for all possible experiences after death? Can it be anything else than the domination of our emotions over our reason? For when there arises a Confucius, a Buddha, a Jesus, a Plato, an Apollonius of Tyana, or an H. P. Blavatsky to give, by their life, knowledge, and power over the forces of nature, living proof that man *is* a God, we refuse even to exercise the thought and common sense of every day life, and gladly accept the freedom from responsibility offered by religion, namely, that the Great Soul is a *special* creation, endowed with the attributes of Divinity.

To account for other Great Souls showing the same power and

knowledge, the explanation is gravely put forward that they were possessed of the Devil. How else could be reconciled the contradictions in a world supposed to be created by an all-wise, all powerful, and withal, a "loving" God? What easier then, than the next step? To set the righteous wrath of the believer in one divine being against his deluded brothers so perverted as to believe in another? More blood has been let and suffering endured by men who thought they were helping "God" in his battle against the "Devil," than from all other causes of human misery combined.

Is there to be found in that which we call Religion a *knowledge* of Life, Death and Immortality? We have but to look to see that at best both its professors and devotees have developed in themselves a supreme, but blind, faith—faith and hope prostituted to serve the desire for personal salvation. Now, whatever the facts in regard to life, they exist regardless of our beliefs, and must be discoverable by the same methods under which our present working knowledge of life was obtained, however circumscribed that knowledge may be. All the faith and prayers in the world could not alter one of the definitely proven laws of Physics, Chemistry or Electricity.

When for the first time the mind is freed from the mists of emotion, and the realization comes that all we use—even the things so far not understood—yield themselves to natural explanations upon discovery of their inherent qualities, is it any wonder that Science should be hailed as our deliverer from ignorance? But here, too, very soon we come face to face with what seems an impassable wall. Science endeavors to eschew all belief, to test and prove every step of the way, and there is nothing which lends itself to the present scientific mode of research except the forms of matter. Regardless of the extent of our knowledge of the forms and properties of matter, no explanation is forthcoming in that direction as to their *essential* nature, their relation to man, what man is, and why he exists. It is apparent after even a little reflection that Life does not consist of form alone. There are other factors. We soon see that forms, any kind of forms, actually have no existence of themselves, but depend entirely upon the mysterious indwelling power which animates them: Power, a force, a potency—call it what you will—which incessantly, so far as we can see, creates, preserves, and destroys all forms. There should be no question as to the value of true scientific investigation of facts over and against the purely religious attitude of blind belief. The failure of Science

to give any but a physical explanation of birth and death must be charged to its neglect to investigate with equal impartiality and intelligence the additional factors which go to make up this kaleidoscopic condition we call Life. Where can one find *synthesis* in Science or Religion—a set of theorems provable mathematically, because taking into account the factors of existence in their entirety? Let us go to those spiritual teachers who have stood the test of time and who showed they *knew* something in regard to themselves and nature, and see what these practical Theosophists had to say of Death and Immortality.

Everything, so these sages taught, regardless of differences in form, has at root one common quality. That quality is consciousness, or the power to perceive. Periodically this universal consciousness manifests from That into which no man or mind however high can enquire—*"That"* which is the *Om* of the ancient Sanscrit scriptures, the "God around whose pavilion there is darkness" of the Bible, the true Deity underlying every degraded symbol of godhood in the mind of man or the dogmas of religion. Under rigid, unerring law, inherent in its nature, this consciousness evolves the powers with which to construct the states, planes, and forms which It perceives. We are that perceiving consciousness, as is also every atom of the universe we see about us. All nature, therefore, and man, is said to be septenary: The Perceiver, using imagination, mind, feeling, life-force, a design body and a physical body, to acquire first, a sense of individuality (this attribute distinguishing the human kingdom), and then, by self-induced and self-devised efforts, to come to the conscious realization that the All, the Perceiver, and that which is perceived are identical. This achievement, with its resultant knowledge of Self, of power over nature, is exhibited in the perfected men of all time, the gods and divine instructors spoken of in the history and tradition of every race of mankind.

Applied to all we see about us, this teaching explains the myriad varieties of form, explains their intelligent action, and their constant death and rebirth. These forms, visible and invisible, are simply the vehicles of non-individualized consciousness gaining experience. But what of ourselves? We too, have a physical form, a form gathered from all the kingdoms of nature. This form is not alone subject to disintegration and death as a unit, but momentarily in all its parts is constantly being rebuilt by the death and rebirth of its constituents. The body dies, but man, the self-con-

scious Perceiver is not aware of it. Without break he is perceiving through his finer physical pattern-body, sometimes called the astral body. This is the field of sense-perceptions, the cause in physical waking life of our control and use of the trained army of "lives" called our physical body. Into this first state-after-death we have all penetrated many times and brought back the memory, for our dreams in most part are but the remembered snatches of our nightly passage through this plane of existence.

All forms are subject to death, and this collection of sense-perceptions called the astral body finally disintegrates much as the abandoned physical envelope; but still the perceiver, man, is unaware of anything but a different set of perceptions. The noble thoughts of his lifetime, unclouded by feelings and unhampered by limitations of circumstance or physical body, now unroll before his gaze, and he experiences that state which present day theology has distorted into a physical "heaven." At last he is truly in bliss, because for the time being he possesses no instrument which reacts to the sensations of like and dislike. But even this "body" in this state, long as it may last, finally meets the inevitable fate of all form—death. Where are the words even to approximate the condition of the Perceiver freed of all limitations imposed by the instruments of his lower nature, existing in a body and a state which has sometimes been designated as that of pure Spirit?

Scarcely a man or woman of mature years, but can recollect a fleeting moment or so when for the time they were entirely unconscious of their body; when their feelings were completely stilled; when their mind for the brief moment rested motionless, and yet they were conscious—conscious with a sense of power, serenity and rightness, which left them feeling calm and refreshed. If we were to expand the possibilities of this moment to the limit of our imagination, we could probably gain some faint conception of the state of immortal man on his own plane. But let us not forget, it is One Life. Wherever man—the Perceiver—is, on whatever plane he looks, he is part and parcel of the one universal Consciousness. This fact, which makes him immortal whether he is aware of it or not, ties him to those circumstances and conditions of life which he himself has created. Inevitably, then, must arise that particular combination of events in accordance with the law inherent in all life, tending to restore equilibrium, which will draw the Perceiver back again into the appropriate instruments enabling him to experience the effects of the causes he has set in motion. We here re-

joice at a birth. A new body has been gathered together and brought within the range of our physical perceptions. But, to the Immortal Ego entering that form, it is but another change—death on one plane, followed by birth on another.

Let us not think that this "embodied existence" is an inferior or undesirable state. True, the instruments through which we perceive are more universal, allow wider horizons and impose less friction the deeper we penetrate into our own nature. Nevertheless, it is here in waking physical existence that conscious immortality must be achieved. Consider that here all our vehicles are available. An old comparison pictures the perceiving consciousness as the charioteer endeavoring to control his six unruly horses. The loss of one horse eases the problem of control, but likewise lessens by just that much the potential power of the perfect team. We owe a duty to the lives composing our physical body, a duty in proportion to the duty we owe the intangible but real "lives" composing our finer sheaths. What is this duty? Let us but once come to a realization that all *is* Life, indissolubly One, differing only in degree—and the attitude of *un*selfishness gradually becomes as natural as our present acquired sense of separateness. An impartial comparison of the teachings of every god-like being down the ages will convince any enquirer that every single one of them pointed to this unity of Life. Brotherhood to them was a reality, not a theory. By example and precept they have ever tried to awaken mankind to the fact that this road, and none other, leads to that knowledge prized by the wise of all time—*conscious* Immortality—to the certainty that Death is but another name for change.

Conscious Immortality

The one Spirit is in all, is the property of each, therefore It is always there, alway with us, and, by reflecting on that, little room is left for sorrow or delusion. If we believe that the soul of all is measured by the whole of Time and not by a part, then we care not for these moments which relate alone to our body. If we live in our hearts we soon prove that time and space exist not.—*W.Q.J.*

BEEHIVE OR CHAOS?

EVERY extreme of thought is the efflorescence, often the running to seed, of an inherent racial idea. Such ideas in turn are always based on the partial perception of a fact or pattern in nature. In regard to the problem of conjoining individual human activities for the accomplishment of given ends, there have always been two oppositely-directed streams of thought, each running in cases to fantastic extremes. Oddly enough, in present world politics, the very antitheses of thought in these directions are lumped together in popular estimation. They are Communism and Anarchy. The one desires to absorb all activities into the State; the other to annihilate the State. The one has for ideal the smoothly humming efficacy of the beehive, in which each living cog meshes inexorably with each other one; the other desires to strip the individual will bare of every hampering bond.

If we look to Nature for signs of basic patterns from which such extremes take their cue, we find the beehive pattern in the rigid regularity of chemical reactions, the fixed coursing of the electrons in the atom about their nucleus. Almost immediately, though, do we find there the other extreme. The action of a mass of atoms, or the spraying of a mass of electrons, can as *mass* be well foreseen down a vista of mathematical figures. But no human power can predict the course of an individual atom or electron. In the forest we find the neat striping of the squirrel seemingly as much alike in all members of the species as though done with a brushing machine in the most modern factory upon carven toys. But in the forest-life the "survival of the fittest—" pure moral anarchy to the human point of view—rules supreme. Each plant of a given species is constructed exactly by rote under the same biological law of growth. But the naturalist will seek in vain for two leaves which have arrived at maturity with the same contours.

There is seldom any mistaking a Chinaman for a Hindu, a Negro for a Caucasian. But no one ever knew two Chinamen, two Hindus, two Negroes or two Caucasians exactly alike. Thus the paradox of order and disorder, law and apparent chance, begins its divergence at the very roots of manifestation; it culminates in the human race. In the most advanced stages of civilization men strive for the utmost systematization and regularization at the very moment of history when individual characters diverge most widely.

What is the answer? It is lack of an answer which splits all unconsciously, the sects in science, in religion, in politics, in economics.

The answer leaps almost at once to the eye of the Theosophist. It is *orderly* freedom; it is initiative within law. The very atom is Life; its heart is incipient consciousness. Consciousness is coeval with Will and Thought, however much concealed in the germ. And these in turn spell Individuality. Absolute unconsciousness spells absolute mechanical motion without deviation. Absolute consciousness is synonymous with absolute freedom. But absolute freedom cannot exist anywhere in the presence of another individuality; absolute unconsciousness—absolute order—is a theoretical extreme actually existing nowhere in all Space. If there were such, consciousness could never arise therefrom even in germ; and Space is Life.

It is evident therefore that evolution could never begin in any direction, good or evil, if mere mechanical motion, synonymous with absolute regularity, and itself an eternal series of repetitions unless interfered with, were the ruling power. Without a law governing growth every incipient trend toward a definite end would be destroyed instantly in the chaos of unruled forces. It is evident, then, that the procession of manifestation depends wholly upon a workable balance between Will and Law. Either without the other is static; eternal chaos on the one hand, eternal repetition on the other. Study indicates to the thoughtful that every disjunction and disharmony in the affairs of man, mineral, or animal arises from an overbalance in the one direction or the other. The overbalance in one direction results in a swing to the opposite extreme. Anarchy in a social system brings about an upheaval, resulting in dictatorships and tyrannies. Rigid regularity, the crushing of all initiative that mechanical-minded leaders may enjoy the glistening of smoothly meshing cogs, results in the revolt of outraged independence, or in dry-rot. America is learning the one lesson; Russia the other. They say truly who think that Russia and America will ultimately arrive at the same point over opposite roads.

Never to date in modern history, in Church or State, has a permanent balance been arrived at; never has the wisdom and power of the strong been in a proper complement with the resources of the mass. Either the mass has lain under tyranny or good men on high have had their hands bound by the inchoate desires and unreason of the mob. For brief moments have States, like individuals, experienced peaceful equilibrium, but in retrospect those moments have been recognized as mere transitions of the social pendulum across the medium point.

How emerge from these alternations?

Only by spiritual wisdom. If man lives for self, then whatever of free-will he enjoys must infallibly result in ill for others; the only safety for others is in burdensome restraints on such free-will. If a man lives for All-Self only, and intelligently, then the more freedom he enjoys, the better for all. He has transcended Law and Order, because he embodies them. When a state of society shall be arrived at in which the citizen uses all he can develop of will and wisdom, for the common good first, and himself last, there will be an end of restraints and of forced harmonies and regularizations; their necessity will fade away. Such a State must be born in the midst of the State as it now exists, absorbing the latter by degrees. It means that some few must form it, building an *imperium in imperio,* conforming to laws, but voluntarily transcending the limited moralities of law. They must live in the midst of a hostile order without themselves being hostile; must learn to foil without destruction the hordes of social beasts of prey tempted by their seeming softness. Was not something once said concerning the harmlessness of the dove and the wisdom of the serpent? How can this miracle be accomplished?

A total absence of self-interest not only clips the claws of the enemy, even causing him to purr in the process; it clarifies the vision of its possessor, so that he no longer confuses the journey of life with incidents of travel.

NOTHING REMAINS UNCHANGED

Time is only an illusion produced by the succession of our states of consciousness as we travel through eternal duration, and it does not exist where no consciousness exists in which the illusion can be produced; but "lies asleep." The present is only a mathematical line which divides that part of eternal duration which we call the future, from that part which we call the past. Nothing on earth has real duration, for nothing remains without change—or the same—for the billionth part of a second; and the sensation we have of the actuality of the division of "time" known as the present, comes from the blurring of that momentary glimpse, or succession of glimpses, of things that our senses give us, as those things pass from the region of ideals which we call the future, to the region of memories that we name the past.—*S.D. I,* p. 37.

ON THE LOOKOUT

Unconscious Scientific Humor

A considerable degree of percipience is achieved by the famous scientist, Dr. Millikan, in a speech in which he predicates a "new type of leadership capable of meeting man's intellectual and moral needs," to be in vogue for next century. Science and its applications, said Dr. Millikan, "have now made it possible to satisfy the material needs of man, at least in the Western world." Tactfully omitting any discussion of just how it happens that that "possibility" has resulted in the actuality of more widespread suffering and uncertainty as to material needs than has ever existed in the Western world to date, Dr. Millikan goes on to say that intellectual and moral wants have not been satisfied, or even realized, except by a few. "The most inspiring job of the next century," he says, "would be the satisfaction of these higher needs after men's stomachs are full." Until the principal of those needs, a social conscience now conspicuously lacking, and especially in science, is *first* satisfied, there will be no equitably filled stomachs; a "filled stomach" in itself is a hindrance rather than a help to *real* satisfaction of such needs.

"Some group," says Dr. Millikan, "that is awake to the needs of a changing world, that can adapt itself to and keep in step with the march of knowledge, is bound to realize and run to meet that challenge."

So far so good. The eminent *savant* has been obviously if unconsciously reading in the "astral light;" and not exclusively in those layers pertaining to a very far distant future. But he must have his little joke! "Why," says he, "should not that group be the church of America?" The group to which he spoke—a conference on religious education—no doubt mistook the nature of the joke; as much so as Dr. Millikan himself.

Chemical Warfare—Humane?

Some time ago Prof. Charles L. Parsons stated, in defense of chemical warfare:

> A tremendous amount of sensational material is put out in reference to chemical warfare which has no real basis in fact.
>
> I do not believe that the chemists of the world, any-

> where, are making any special attempt, as many people imagine they are, to develop new forms of poison gas for the next war.
>
> One thing I would like to emphasize: "Chemical warfare" is greatly misunderstood. For from being the most terrible form of warfare, it is the most humane. The popular mind does not carry that impression.
>
> It may sound strange, but this is demonstrated by facts, and in America, England, France, and Germany the facts are essentially these: At the close of the war, while 30 per cent. of the casualties came from gas, yet gas was responsible for only 2 per cent. of the deaths. That can be proved.
>
> All warfare is terrible, and I want to see it done away with. But if we must have warfare, then chemical warfare is going to be the least terrible aspect of it. (*Literary Digest*, September 18, 1931).

The point overlooked by Prof. Parsons—a slight point perhaps to those who have neither had gas in their lungs nor seen those who have—is that death is a rather pleasant alternative to the sort of thing inflicted by gas warfare upon its victims. If it is more humane to leave a man an eroded husk, empty of everything except pain and despair, for years and often for the rest of life, than to kill him quickly, then gas war is humane. Prof. Parson's "belief" that no special efforts are being made to develop gas warfare is worth just as much as any other "belief." Both his "belief" and his definition of "humane" may be largely accounted for by the fact that he is, or at the time of writing was, secretary of the American Chemical Society. If we must have wars, someone will necessarily profit. If someone must profit, why not the chemical industry? Under the circumstances a slight elasticity of belief and a pliable definition of "humanity" is perhaps understandable. The chemical industry, like all others, is badly in need of business; and what better customers than Governmental bureaus?

AMERICA'S RESPONSIBILITY

The following is particularly illuminating:

> Killing a regiment of men as if they were a swarm of flies is revealed as a new war trick which our genial Uncle Sam has mastered.
>
> It is "a system of wiping out entire regiments and populations by means of spraying mustard-gas—the most deadly weapon yet devised for modern war—from airplanes," explains a Washington correspondent of the Baltimore *Sun*.

Hitherto the problem has been to spray the gas without killing the aviator.

Despite American protestations and pledges against the use of poison gas made during the Washington Arms Conference, . . . the Army Air Corps and the Chemical Warfare Service have developed the system after tests covering three years at Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland. . . .

Altho the United States was one of the nations which enthusiastically went on record against poison gas during the Washington Conference, this action was taken by a resolution rather than by treaty, and four years later the Senate rejected a treaty, signed in Geneva by forty-seven nations, outlawing the use of poison gas. Altho the United States signed the pact, ratification was blocked by the lobbying of the American Legion and chemical interests. (*Literary Digest*, August 29, 1931).

A Different Viewpoint

Jeneral Jan Christian Smuts, the modest Boer who has risen steadily in the estimation of the observant as a humanitarian, philosopher, and thinker, and who is now President of the British A.A.S., was not quite so cheerful in a speech delivered at Sheffield University:

The armed peace led to the World War. Would it had ended there! But the armed peace continues in an aggravated form and as long as it continues mankind seems to be marching to some horrible doom. . . .

In the World War we saw only the beginning of the vast difference which science is making in human affairs. In the next great war, if that is ever allowed to occur, science will, like some angry outraged deity, go far to destroy mankind itself. The next war will be unlike anything which has been called war in the past.

The time-honored name of war would not properly apply to it. It will pay scant attention to armies and navies or to the other paraphernalia of war. It will go straight for the populations and for the immense urban aggregations which will be its sure target.

It will fight with new and un-heard-of chemical and biological weapons. It will cover the fair land and the great cities with poison and disease germs. It will saturate vast areas with a deadly atmosphere.

There will be no escape, not even for the statesmen and the war makers and a pall of death will rest over all. Even

now the laboratories of three continents are busy with their deadly researches.

And in due course some lunatic will press the button and the flower of the human race will be trapped and destroyed.

There is still a way of escape, but it lies along the arduous path of disarmament. Surely sufficient has been said to show why we should without further delay take to that path. (*Los Angeles Times*, October 9, 1931).

DISARMAMENT?

The present times of economic stress bid fair to raise an angry public opinion against excessive armament, such as mere impractical humanitarianism has never been able to command. The idea that war should not be engaged in for the mere reason that it hurts a foreigner, causes him grief and pain to have his lungs burned out, his limbs shot off, his house burned and his children disemboweled by aerial bombs, has always seemed a bit dreamy and far-fetched to the mind of the world. But the clink of cold hard dollars sounds a more powerful note; a note wisely employed by President Hoover in his disarmament campaign.

SEVENTY PER CENT INCREASE

The world expenditure on all arms is now nearly $5,000,000,000 yearly, an increase of about 70 per cent over that previous to the great war. We stand today with near 5,500,000 men actively under arms and 20,000,000 more in reserve.

These vast forces, greatly exceeding those of the pre-war period . . . continue not only a burden upon the economic recuperation of the world, but, of more consequence, the constant threats and fears which arise from it are a serious contribution to all forms of instability, whether social, political or economic.

An increase of 70 per cent in the cost of world armaments over the cost of the same previous to the debacle of the World War is a shameful and shocking spectacle of callous indifference to the lessons of that universal calamity. President Hoover has done the world a service in giving it emphasis in a place where that emphasis may prove most effective. (Editorial in the *Los Angeles Times*).

Facts and the Future

Mr. Hoover has also emphasized the fact that three-quarters of our governmental expenditures are used up in paying for past, and preparing for future wars.

Disarmament has always been solidly blocked by vicious commercial interests, largely working under cover. At the present time they have the additional argument that real disarming cannot be accomplished without further disrupting manufacture and turning hundreds of thousands of men on to the streets to swell the formidable ranks of the unemployed.

Economic debacle has wiped out the worst dangers for the present. For any major country in the world to engage in a serious war at present would mean the precipitation of a savage revolution, and every statesman knows it. An European war of the proportions of 1914 would mean the certain Bolshevization of the entire Continent.

Nevertheless the continued uncertainty, distrust, and material burden of militarism, will have its evil effects—in nervous strain, international hatreds and fears expressed in retaliations nearly as bad as war; in graft, chicanery and intrigue carried on between military and commercial interests, with the resulting burdens to the people; in continued destruction of the rights of free speech and peaceful sentiment in all countries. The suppressed psychological poisons, denied expression in international war, will explode disastrously within the national boundaries, adding new intensities, and perhaps undreamed-of horrors, to the coming social reckonings.

The "Golden Age"—A La Mode

In smoldering resentment, a suffering working class is feeling about ever more intensely for the basic cause of its misery, and coming dangerously close to the facts—in their purely material aspect. In defense, the proponents of the "machine age," the owners, operators, salesmen direct and indirect who form the priests of the modern Moloch, are bestirring themselves more than ever with the propaganda which has created some of the most dangerous economic delusions ever suffered by a great people. In 1929, *our year of greatest prosperity,* we actually had upon our hands millions of unemployed *permanently* forced out of a livelihood by machinery. This fact has been concealed by the most disingenuous methods; methods which smack altogether too much of deliber-

ately misleading propaganda. The truth, however, will out; it will be *forced* out by the coming upheavals.

Meantime many of those of a class which has previously trumpeted the siren call of the cogs from the housetops, are either trimming sails to the coming squalls, or are repenting themselves somewhat. Among such is Dr. C. C. Furnas, a professor of chemical engineering at Yale. He opines that the "two-hour day" is coming, which will represent the real Golden Age of civilization. He has perhaps failed to consult a sufficiency of those who are now, due to the beneficence of the machine, trying to keep body and soul together on just about that. Says Dr. Furnas:

> With more machines than we have hitherto dreamed of, doing all of our physical and the routine part of our mental labor, and with their products justly distributed, we shall be all "on velvet." (*Literary Digest*, Jan. 16, 1932).

PROSPERITY COMING—HOW?

The real answer, based on unbroken experience of the past, is that so far from "all" being "on velvet," a very few will be smothered in poisonous surfeits, while the rest will be dependent for their very lives upon the sufferance of the former—unless human patience cracks first. This "just distribution"—exactly how is it to happen, unless some one *makes* it happen? To date there have been but the fewest and most sporadic attempts at even adequate recognition of this problem, and those of recent origin. Apparently the pious hope is that the necessary distribution of leisure and goods will come about of itself—the modern substitute for "the Lord will provide." Ten million men, numbering with their families twenty-five millions, out of work and nearly out of hope while industry continues on a scale to be regarded as extravagantly luxurious by any other nation, witness but poorly for this "coming about." Dr. Furnas, needless to say, furnishes not the slightest shadow of a plan to produce this result, and barely more than a recognition that it is high time someone began to pay attention to the problem.

Yet he does have misgivings:

> The most important thing that our industrialism will give us will be leisure. Some of us have entirely too much and others not enough.
>
> Estimates have been made that in colonial times each individual, on the average, had three slave-power units at

> his command, either in person, in horses, or in water-wheels. Now, a few generations later, we each have, on the average, one hundred and sixty-five slave power units, mostly in copper wires or tanks of gasoline. Yet, is our working time cut to three one-hundred-sixty-fifths of that of the colonial period? It is evident that the arithmetic has slipt somewhere.

In fact at times Dr. Furnas verges upon downright treason to the machine. He recognizes the limitations to the vicious fallacy of "consumptionism:"

> There is a limit, also, to the number of things we can possess and enjoy, for there are only a few hours in a day, and relatively few days in a lifetime. While some have nothing to do but sit down and waste away and wish for work, for the rest of us the laboring hours are still too long. Then, when we do leave the manufacturing precincts, we spend all the rest of the time using mechanical things, so that there will be a market for manufactured articles, so we can work all day to-morrow. This keeps on until heart failure or a misstep in traffic closes the account.

Then What?

Among the few who recognize that unadulterated leisure *may* not be an unmixed blessing, Dr. Furnas also remarks:

> The social problems arising from such an age of leisure will be infinite. What to do? How to keep out of trouble? What's the use, anyway? Someone will have to answer these questions, and I nominate the educational system. . . . Most of the routine affairs of the world can be carried on by brainless robots, and why shouldn't they be? There are so many other more interesting things for humans to do.

Just what in all common sense are these "more interesting things" to do? Invent more and more devices, tricks, trapperies, and mechanical stratagems with which to increase an already overfed and slightly nauseated ease? Dr. Furnas, and some few others like him, may perhaps be able to think of other "more interesting things" for *themselves* to do. But what of Tom, Dick, and Harry, whose limitations in that direction are ubiquitously obvious? The "other interesting things," plus the curse of unlimited leisure, speedily resolve into "routine affairs" themselves. Is there anything more painful to behold, more saddening and soddening to endure,

than the routine of the golf-club millionaire or the drudgery of the bridge-playing matron?

A World of Othellos?

From the viewpoint of leisure as an unmixed good, and of the pious hope that such leisure will be well-distributed, Dr. Furnas' following pronouncements are doubtless harbingers of hope and brightness:

> There are a number of things which the machine has not yet been trained to do, but we Americans are working hard on the job. . . .
>
> This inventive flame is like other fires, the hotter it gets, the faster it goes; which makes it hotter, and so on and on until the fuel is gone. We still seem to have a good supply of fuel. . . .
>
> There are a great many things that mechanical fingers can do better than human ones. In some factories you may see one man tending ten automatic machines. A tractor-drawn harvester with four men now threshes grain faster than forty men did a few years ago.
>
> Even inspectors are becoming obsolete. Photo-electric cells can separate the different grades of cigars or apples better than the eye. They can count articles faster than any human. They can ring a bell to tell a fireman that he is creating a smoke nuisance.
>
> The guiding slogan of every industrial superintendent for years has been "more production per man-hour." Still, the campaign is only begun. Men and women should be saved for those places where judgment and brains are required.
>
> There is no reason why the accounting business can not be largely automatic; the necessary machines are, or soon will be, available. A robot bank-teller should perform to perfection; it could do anything but pass judgment upon the soundness of a man's credit.

Retrospect Upon a Prophecy

A writer in the *New York Times,* November 30, 1930, had this to say regarding the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act.

> . . . Following the passage of the act there came from every corner of the world a volume of angry protest and retaliation which has scarcely diminished to this day. The act was a blow struck by one nation at the economic stability of sixty nations. It was the blind, desperate, effort of a great

country to hang on to the top of the ladder by kicking at every other country.

Take the case of Switzerland, for example, The Swiss Republic is a nation of watchmakers. She has no natural resources; she imports all her raw materials. She has been shipping to the United States approximately $11,000,000 worth of watches and watch movements every year. Our new tariff bill closed the doors of most of her factories. A handful of men, sitting around a table in Washington in an atmosphere heavy with ignorance and cigar smoke, decreed that the chief industry of a country 3,000 miles away be shut down.

This is not world order. It is anarchy. Even from the standpoint of our own self-interest it is catastrophe. For Switzerland was buying from us $40,000,000 worth of goods a year. With her principal industry in ruins, and with the ramifying effect of that collapse upon her own purchasing power, with what funds will she buy from us in the future, even if she now had the desire? A national tariff act, passed in utter disregard of its consequences abroad, is today an anachronism.

Muscovite Morals

Now comes Junius B. Wood, special correspondent of the *New York Sun* (March 15, 1932) to explode one of the last fables about Russia—the "easy morals" idea. True, there are Russian enthusiasts who deplore the "backwardness" of popular practice—said "backwardness" lying in the continued existence of the family and family morals, "in spite of advanced laws." But why talk as though that particular type of "advanced thinker" were confined to Russia exclusively when we have him ranting his barnyard code on the pages of our own "smart" magazines?

In actual practice, says Mr. Wood, things are pretty strict if not actually drab. There is some grim irony in the fact that thousands of men and women were attracted from *other* countries by the very tales of loose love and loose living, only to meet disappointment; no doubt upon returning to their own countries, swelled the outcry, "sour grapes" fashion. "Many of the sterner sex," says Mr. Wood, were "lured by the dream of marriage without responsibility."

"What's the difference? I can divorce her any time I want to," one of these assured me. Of course he could and he did, but before he got a visa to leave the country he had to put up $10,000—not in Soviet rubles but good American

> dollars—as guaranty that his ex-wife would not be in want and that if any progeny might materialize he would pay half of its support until it reached 18 years of age.

The simple fact is that, in their odd half-oriental way, the Soviets cut the ecclesiastic red tape by going to the heart of social responsibility—adhering unconsciously to a motif which might have been set by a study of Karmic law. "Do exactly what you please," they say in effect, "but prepare to take the responsibility to the last hour and the last farthing." Soviet marriage consists of simply registering with the city clerk. *If a couple live together without registering, they are just as effectively married with all the consequences.* No wonder the Soviet idea severely frightens our own pious population!

In point of fact, in spite of very easy divorce—except for the afore-mentioned consequences—the ratio of marriages to divorces in Russia is about the same as in America.

A Masonic Utterance

> We are living in a remarkable age. Despite present day economic conditions, the average home in America boasts more actual comforts and conveniences than the feudal baron ever enjoyed. Science, invading every field, has succeeded in producing manifold improvements all looking to the maximum of comfort in modern life.
>
> And yet, despite the innumerable benefits and advantages shared alike and enjoyed by our citizens today, there is something lacking in the scheme of modern living. Perhaps by the use of a single word I can correctly approximate this condition, so patent to even the casual observer—"consideration."
>
> Many people, apparently, have long since forgone the practice of this beautiful quality. It appears to be too much "me and mine" uppermost in the thoughts of men today—*my* rights, *my* privileges, *my* pleasures—the other fellow can "go hang."
>
> Thus we see plain selfishness manifested on many hands. For instance, the inconsiderate motorist who practises every underhanded trick to push his car ahead of his fellow's on the highway; the neighbor who delights in permitting his high-powered radio to blare forth in the still watches of the night; the fond parent whose unruly children are allowed and even encouraged to make the neighborhood ring with raucous shouts at times when tired and perhaps ill persons are seeking rest and relaxation. Many other cases could be

adduced to show the inconsiderate attitude of a very large number of men and women today.

Such people apparently do not know or care where their individual rights end and those of their neighbor begin. They, themselves, *must* be satisfied and made happy no matter how many rules of etiquette or ordinary courtesy may be broken in the process. Their pleasures are paramount even to the extent of violating Constitutional law, when the same interferes with their sense of personal liberty. But in the exercise of these selfish pleasures are they really happy? Or do they not sometimes realize that true happiness is to be found in serving others—in helping to bear our brother's burden? (John H. Cowles, Masonic Sovereign Grand Commander, Thirty Third Degree, in *The New Age,* October, 1931).

Free Speech

That an American citizen can no longer, without danger of arrest and abuse, attempt in behalf of free speech practical application of the Constitutional guarantees of the United States, even in a building hired by himself, has for some time since been a principle established by the authorities of Los Angeles—foremost in this as in many other things. That a rigid though unofficial censorship is exercised by and over portions of the Press of the United States is known not only to those who have read Upton Sinclair's *Brass Check,* but to those who have had occasion to be startled by the dissimilarity between social conditions and social events as they have known them, and the same events when described in print.

There remained but one public channel to be closed: the ether. This has been duly accomplished by the Federal Radio Commission in the case of the Reverend "Bob" Shuler. Mr. Shuler—perhaps tiring of the wornout platitudes of his creed—has for some years past elected the role of political and social crusader, chiefly over a radio controlled by him in Los Angeles. His efforts have taken the form principally of denunciations of local politicians and political conditions, delivered with fervor, not to say recklessness. As to the merits and demerits of his charges, we express slight opinion, having on hand insufficient knowledge. In the face of very stringent State libel laws applying to the use of the radio, and enacted mainly if not exclusively for the Reverend gentleman's benefit, the abused authorities seemingly found their only recourse through the Federal Radio Commission. This body closed Dr. Shuler's instrument in January, 1932, on the grounds of habitually reckless and libelous

use contrary to the public interest. The closure was upheld by the Supreme Court on the grounds that the right of free speech was in no way involved, it being ingeniously explained that the press and face-to-face speech were still open to Dr. Shuler! The latter, being a man of resource, speedily found other radio channels through which to broadcast; and probably richer in caution if not in kindliness, is still holding forth.

PROTESTS

So flagrant have become the abuses of radio censorship, not only as carried out officially, but as exercised upon broadcasters by stations themselves, that action is likely to be taken sooner or later. Representative Amlie, of Wisconsin, considerably heated by an incident, called upon the Commission to conserve the rights of free speech. The incident was the barring from the air of Rev. Herman J. Hahn by Station WGR of Buffalo, on the grounds that his sermon "was not of the conventional type," and "attacked the unequal distribution of wealth in the United States!" One wonders seriously whether the rulers of WGR ever heard of a rather well-known book by the name of the New Testament; and if so, whether they ever deigned to read it.

It is only a question of time before the issue of free speech over the radio will come to a head; the coming social reconstruction will bring it about, in all probability.